

### **REMARKS**

The enclosed is responsive to the Examiner's Office Action mailed on February 27, 2006. At the time the Examiner mailed the Office Action claims 1-19 were pending. By way of the present response the Applicants have: 1) amended claims 1, 10, 11, and 14; 2) added no new claims; and 3) canceled claims 5 and 15. As such, claims 1-4, 6-14, and 16-19 are now pending. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application and the allowance of all claims now presented.

#### **Claim Objections**

The Examiner objected to claim 11 because of certain informalities. Claim 11 has been amended to add --device-- after "(WWAN)" to correct the subject of the claim.

#### **Claim Rejections**

##### **35 U.S.C. 102(b) Rejections**

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, and 10-11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ishizaki, et al., U.S. Patent 5,274,388 (hereinafter "Ishizaki").

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 3, and 10-11 are not anticipated by Ishizaki because the reference does not anticipate every element in these claims.

With respect to amended independent claims 1 and 10, Applicants teach and

claim: “a first antenna coupled to a first receiver, wherein the first receiver comprises a first low noise amplifier (LNA) having an input terminal coupled to the first antenna and an output terminal coupled to a first mixer; a second antenna coupled to a second receiver and having a radiation pattern different than a radiation pattern of the first antenna, wherein the second receiver comprises a second low noise amplifier (LNA) having an input terminal coupled to the second antenna and an output terminal coupled to a second mixer; and a voltage controlled oscillator (VCO) coupled to the first mixer and to the second mixer.” Support for the claim amendment may be found in the specification at paragraphs [0010], [0011], [0014], and Figures 1 and 2.

Ishizaki does not teach a voltage controlled oscillator coupled to a first mixer and a second mixer. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Ishizaki does not anticipate all elements of independent claims 1 and 10.

Claims 3 and 11 are dependent on independent claims 1 and 10, respectively. Thus, for at least the same reasons advanced above with respect to independent claims 1 and 10, Applicants respectfully submit that Ishizaki does not anticipate all elements of dependent claims 3 and 11.

### **35 U.S.C. 102(b) Rejections**

The Examiner rejected claims 14-16, and 18-19 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ying, U.S. Patent 6,697,020 (hereinafter “Ying”).

With respect to amended independent claim 14, Applicants teach and claim: “A method, comprising: receiving a first signal from a first antenna at the input terminal of a first receiver and mixing the first signal with an oscillator signal provided by a voltage

controlled oscillator (VCO) to provide a first baseband signal; and receiving a second signal different from the first signal from a second antenna at the input terminal of a second receiver and mixing the second signal with the oscillator signal provided by the voltage controlled oscillator (VCO) to provide a second baseband signal, wherein the radiation pattern of the first antenna is different than the radiation pattern of the second antenna.” Support for the claim amendment may be found in the specification at paragraphs [0010], [0011], and Figures 1 and 2.

Ying does not teach mixing a first signal with an oscillator signal provided by a voltage controlled oscillator, and mixing a second signal with the oscillator signal provided by the voltage controlled oscillator. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Ying does not anticipate all elements of independent claim 14.

Claim 15 has been cancelled.

Claims 16, 18, and 19 are dependent on independent claim 14. Thus, for at least the same reasons advanced above with respect to independent claim 14, Applicants respectfully submit that Ying does not anticipate all elements of dependent claims 16, 18 and 19.

### **35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejections**

The Examiner rejected claims 2, 4, and 12-13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishizaki in view of Ying.

Claims 2 and 4 are dependent on independent claim 1. Claims 12 and 13 are dependent on independent claim 10. Neither Ishizaki nor Ying teach or suggest a voltage controlled oscillator coupled to a first mixer and a second mixer, as claimed in claims 1

and 10. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2, 4, and 12-13 are not rendered obvious by Ishizaki or Ying, independently or in combination, because these references do not teach or suggest each and every element of these claims.

The Examiner rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishizaki in view of Forrester, U.S. Publication No. 2003/0069046 (hereinafter “Forrester”). Claim 5 has been cancelled.

The Examiner rejected claims 6-7 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishizaki in view of Loke, U.S. Publication No. 2003/0027610 (hereinafter “Loke”). Claims 6-7 and 9 are dependent on independent claim 1. Neither Ishizaki nor Loke teach or suggest a voltage controlled oscillator coupled to a first mixer in a first receiver and a second mixer in a second receiver, as claimed in claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 6-7 and 9 are not rendered obvious by Ishizaki or Loke, independently or in combination, because these references do not teach or suggest each and every element of these claims.

The Examiner rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishizaki in view of Ying and Talwar, U.S. Patent No. 6,697,020 (hereinafter “Talwar”). Claim 8 is dependent on independent claim 1. Neither Ying nor Talwar teach or suggest a voltage controlled oscillator coupled to a first mixer in a first receiver and a second mixer in a second receiver, as claimed in claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 6-7 and 9 are not rendered obvious by Ying or Talwar, independently

or in combination, because these references do not teach or suggest each and every element of these claims.

The Examiner rejected claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ying. Claim 17 is dependent on independent claim 14. Ying does not teach or suggest mixing a first signal with an oscillator signal provided by a voltage controlled oscillator, and mixing a second signal with the oscillator signal provided by the voltage controlled oscillator. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 17 is not rendered obvious by Ying because the reference does not teach or suggest each and every element of these claims.

In light of the comments above, the Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of all claims.

## **CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that all rejections have been overcome and that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

If there are any additional charges, please charge them to our Deposit Account Number 02-2666. If a telephone conference would facilitate the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Cyndi M. Wheeler at (916) 356-5358.

Respectfully Submitted,  
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: May 30, 2006

/Cyndi M. Wheeler, Reg. No. 58,156/

Cyndi M. Wheeler  
Reg. No.: 58,156

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(408) 720-8300